

REMARKS

The amendment dated 4-3-03, which was not entered by the last office action but will be entered with the filing of the enclosed REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION, amends Claims 8-14 which were a rewriting of the original claims. The above amendment to claims 8 and 13 correct a few minor typographical errors therein. Newly presented claim 15 and 16 are similar to claims 8 and 13 except that they positively recite an external drive means selectively insertable through one or the other of the sockets at the opposite longitudinal ends of the wrench and into a smaller drive member-receiving bore. Claim 8, which does not positively recite the driver member means, instead states that there is or will be when the parts involved are assembled at each end of the wrench a "first smaller driver member-receiving bore having bore-defining walls adapted to interlock with an external drive member sized to be inserted into the open end of the associated larger outer socket and then moved inwardly into the associated driver member-receiving bore". Thus, all claims recite the details of the structure adapted to receive such an external drive means at a selected end of the wrench and without requiring new assembly of the parts thereof when a particular differently sized nut is to be rotated by the wrench.

The Bellows patent and the even less-relevant Gadberry patent disclose and teach only the incorporation into the wrench of an offset bulky turning handle which is initially a part of, not external to, the wrench assembly. All of the active claims 8-16 clearly define the details of the to be patented assembly parts which must receive an external drive means to rotate the selected drive end of the wrench and without the need to re-assemble the parts of the wrench.

The Martinez and Jarvis patents disclose wrench constructions which are so different from that claimed and from those disclosed in the Bellows and Gadberry patents that these patents cannot be reasonably combined in a manner to meet the claim limitations without improperly having applicant's wrench in mind. Evidence of

this fact is that the Martinez and the Bellows patent wrenches, unlike the claimed wrench, require a new assembly of the parts of the wrenches involved before they can rotate a differently sized nut.

The claims also recite ball member-receiving surfaces clearly not found in the Bellows and Gadberry patents. The fact that the other patents disclose such parts does not undercut the patentability of the claims because the wrenches of these other patents do not disclose or teach the other subject matter of the claims. When none of the patents discloses a wrench or wrench-making parts which can receive an external drive member means for insertion selectively into one or the other end of the wrench without needing a re-assembly of the wrench parts, there clearly should be at least doubts in the Examiner's mind which should be resolved in applicant's favor about whether or not without knowledge of applicant's invention the references themselves teach the subject matter claimed.

It is submitted that the depending claims add patentability to the claims, like depending claims 11 and 12 where the driver member-receiving or the ball member-forming part-receiving bores in the left and right parts of the wrench are recited as being of the same size for ease of initial assembly and use convenience,

For the above reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Russell E. Hattis